

**CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP**

WASHINGTON, DC	ONE LIBERTY PLAZA	ROME
PARIS	NEW YORK, NY 10006-1470	MILAN
BRUSSELS	(212) 225-2000	HONG KONG
LONDON	FACSIMILE (212) 225-3999	BEIJING
FRANKFURT	WWW.CLEARYGOTTLIEB.COM	BUENOS AIRES
COLOGNE		SÃO PAULO
MOSCOW		ABU DHABI
		SEOUL

June 5, 2015

VIA ECF

Hon. Andrew J. Peck, U.S.M.J.  
Southern District of New York  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan Courthouse  
500 Pearl Street, Courtroom 20D  
New York, New York 10007

Re: Rio Tinto plc v. Vale S.A., et al., Civil Action No. 14-cv-3042 (RMB) (AJP) (S.D.N.Y.)

Dear Judge Peck:

Defendant Vale S.A. (“Vale”) respectfully encloses its letter opposing Plaintiff Rio Tinto plc’s (“Rio Tinto”) letter motion of May 26, 2015. At the conference on June 1, 2015, Vale and the Court discussed whether, assuming the Nardello Report<sup>1</sup> was privileged, Vale would nonetheless be willing to produce the report without effecting a broader subject matter waiver of the privilege under Federal Rule of Evidence 502(a). *See* June 1, 2015 Tr. 33:24-34:10. At present, while its motion to dismiss is pending, and before any ruling sustaining the Amended Complaint, Vale is not willing to waive privilege as to the report. It reserves the right to waive if, and only if, the Amended Complaint is sustained. Vale accordingly requests a ruling that the Nardello Report is privileged and that neither attorney-client privilege nor attorney work product protection has been waived. In the alternative, Vale would not object if the Court determines to defer ruling on the present motion until there has been a ruling on the motion to dismiss since, if the motion to dismiss is granted, Rio Tinto’s motion to compel will be moot.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lewis J. Liman  
Lewis J. Liman

cc: All counsel of record (via email)

---

<sup>1</sup> All capitalized terms used but not defined herein have the same meaning as in Vale’s opposition letter.